

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCUNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCUNITED STATES P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. 10/646,172 08/22/2003 Susumu Matsuyama 271303-1011 9104 24504 EXAMINER 07/13/2004 THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP BASICHAS, ALFRED 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

3749 DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		1 \ \ / \
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/646,172	MATSUYAMA, SUSUMU /V V
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alfred Basichas	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) dad will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON!	imely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	August 2003.	
	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	ance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5) Claim(s) 13-20 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5-8 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and an are subject. 	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is ol	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage
Attachment(s)	□	(070.440)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/03. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Purdy (959,804), which shows all of the claimed limitations. Purdy shows, among other things, a lamp including a reservoir 2, a tubular wick 6, and a collar 8,9 with perforations 14. It should be noted that while Purdy does not specifically recite the functional language of the claims, the structure shown is clearly capable of its performance.
- 3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mangin (1,037,948), which shows all of the claimed limitations. Mangin shows, among other things, a lamp including a reservoir 1, a wick 12, a collar 8,9,10,13,14,15, means to adjust the collar (see at least page 1, lines 67-80), a cap 5, and a sleeve 11. It should be noted that while Mangin does not specifically recite the functional language of the claims, the structure shown is clearly capable of its performance.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,172 Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Purdy (959,804) or Mangin (1,037,948), which disclose substantially all of the claimed limitations. Neither Purdy nor Mangin specifically recite the use of glass fiber in making the wick. Official Notice is given that the use of glass fiber in making wicks is old and well known in the art. Such an arrangement has the clear and obvious benefit of providing for long lasting and effective wicks that provide brighter illumination.

 Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated glass fiber wicks into the invention disclosed by Purdy or Mangin, so as to provide for long lasting and effective wicks that provide brighter illumination.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 13-20 are allowed.

8. Claims 5-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 703 306 3476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on 703 308 1935. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 0861.

July 9, 2004

/Alfred*Basichas Primary Examiner 703 306 3476